FILED

1	Brett L. Gibbs, Esq. (SBN 251000) Of Counsel to Prenda Law Inc.				
2	38 Miller Avenue, #263 Mill Valley, CA 94941 CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES				
3	110 311 67 10 11 1				
4	A ttorney for Plaintiff				
5	Anomey for Fidinity				
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE				
7					
8	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
9	CV12-6662				
0	INGENUITY13 LLC,				
1	INGENUITY13 LLC, Plaintiff, v. Plaintiff, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, V. Plaintiff, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, V.				
2	JOHN DOE) COMPLAINT				
3	Defendant.				
4) DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL				
15					
16	Plaintiff Ingenuity13 LLC ("Plaintiff"), through its undersigned counsel, hereby files this				
17	Complaint requesting damages and injunctive relief, and alleges as follows:				
18	NATURE OF THE CASE				
19	1. Plaintiff files this action for copyright infringement under the United States Copyright				
20	Act and related contributory infringement and negligence claims under the common law to combat				
21	the willful and intentional infringement of its creative works. Unidentified Defendant John Doe				
22	("Defendant"), whose name Plaintiff expects to ascertain during discovery, knowingly and illegally				
23	reproduced and distributed Plaintiff's copyrighted Video by acting in concert with others via the				
24					
25	BitTorrent file sharing protocol and, upon information and belief, continues to do the same. In using				
26	BitTorrent, Defendant's infringment actions furthered the efforts of numerous others in infringing on				
27	Plaintiff's copyrighted works. The result: exponential viral infringment. Plaintiff seeks a permanent				
28					

this behavior.

3

4

5

6

8

7

10

9

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

injunction, statutory or actual damages, award of costs and attorney's fees, and other relief to curb

THE PARTIES

- Plaintiff Ingenuity13 LLC is a limited liability company organized and existing under 2. the laws of the Federation of Saint Kitts and Nevis. Plaintiff is a holder of rights to various copyrighted works, and is the exclusive holder of the relevant rights with respect to the copyrighted creative work at issue in this Complaint.
- The copyrighted work at issue in this complaint is one of Plaintiff's adult 3. entertainment videos, "Five Fan Favorites" (the "Video").
- Defendant's actual name is unknown to Plaintiff. Instead, Defendant is known to 4. Plaintiff only by an Internet Protocol address ("IP address"), which is a number assigned to devices, such as computers, that are connected to the Internet. In the course of monitoring Internet-based infringement of its copyrighted content, Plaintiff's agents observed unlawful reproduction and distribution occurring over IP address 96.248.225.171 via the BitTorrent file transfer protocol. Plaintiff cannot ascertain Defendant's actual identity without limited expedited discovery.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's copyright infringement claim under 17 U.S.C. §§ 101, et seq., (the Copyright Act), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (actions arising under the laws of the United States), and 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a) (actions arising under an Act of Congress relating to copyrights). This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's contributory infringement and negligence claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) because they are so related to Plaintiff's copyright infringement claim, which is within this Court's original jurisdiction, that the claims form part of the same case and controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.

- 6. This Court has personal jurisdiction because, upon information and belief, Defendant either resides in or committed copyright infringement in the State of California. Plaintiff used geolocation technology to trace the IP address of the Defendant to a point of origin within the State of California. Geolocation is a method for ascertaining the likely geographic region associated with a given IP address at a given date and time. Although not a litmus test for personal jurisdiction, the use of geolocation gives Plaintiff good cause for asserting that personal jurisdiction is proper over the Defendant.
- 7. Venue is properly founded in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1400(a) because Defendant resides in this District, may be found in this District, or a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims in this action occurred within this District.

BACKGROUND

- 8. BitTorrent is a modern file sharing method ("protocol") used for distributing data via the Internet.
- 9. Traditional file transfer protocols involve a central server, which distributes data directly to individual users. This method is prone to collapse when large numbers of users request data from the central server, in which case the server can become overburdened and the rate of data transmission can slow considerably or cease altogether. In addition, the reliability of access to the data stored on a server is largely dependent on the server's ability to continue functioning for prolonged periods of time under high resource demands.
- 10. Standard P2P protocols involve a one-to-one transfer of whole files between a single uploader and single downloader. Although standard P2P protocols solve some of the issues associated with traditional file transfer protocols, these protocols still suffer from such issues as scalability. For example, when a popular file is released (e.g. an illegal copy of the latest blockbuster movie) the initial source of the file performs a one-to-one whole file transfer to a third party, who

the spread of a file across the world because the initial spread is so limited.

11. In contrast, the BitTorrent protocol is a decentralized method of distributing data.

Instead of relying on a central server to distribute data directly to individual users, the BitTorrent

then performs similar transfers. The one-to-one whole file transfer method can significantly delay

- Instead of relying on a central server to distribute data directly to individual users, the BitTorrent protocol allows individual users to distribute data among themselves. Further, the BitTorrent protocol involves breaking a single large file into many small pieces, which can be transferred much more quickly than a single large file and, in turn, redistributed much more quickly than a single large file. Moreover, each peer can download missing pieces of the file from multiple sources—often simultaneously—which causes transfers to be fast and reliable. After downloading a piece, a peer automatically becomes a source for the piece. This distribution method contrasts sharply with a one-to-one whole file transfer method.
- 12. In BitTorrent vernacular, individual downloaders/distributors of a particular file are called peers. The group of peers involved in downloading/distributing a particular file is called a swarm. A server which stores a list of peers in a swarm is called a tracker. A computer program that implements the BitTorrent protocol is called a BitTorrent client. Each swarm is unique to a particular file.
- This file contains information about the files to be shared and about the tracker, the computer that coordinates the file distribution. Second, the user loads the torrent file into a BitTorrent client, which automatically attempts to connect to the tracker listed in the torrent file. Third, the tracker responds with a list of peers and the BitTorrent client connects to those peers to begin downloading data from and distributing data to the other peers in the swarm. When the download is complete, the BitTorrent client continues distributing data to other peers in the swarm until the user manually disconnects from the swarm or the BitTorrent client otherwise does the same.

- 14. The degree of anonymity provided by the BitTorrent protocol is extremely low. Because the protocol is based on peers connecting to one another, a peer must broadcast identifying information (i.e. an IP address) before it can receive data. Nevertheless, the actual names of peers in a swarm are unknown, as the users are allowed to download and distribute under the cover of their IP addresses.
- 15. The BitTorrent protocol is an extremely popular method for transferring data. The size of swarms for popular files can reach into the tens of thousands of unique peers. A swarm will commonly have peers from many, if not every, state in the United States and several countries around the world. And every peer in the swarm participates in distributing the file to dozens, hundreds, or even thousands of other peers.
- 16. The BitTorrent protocol is also an extremely popular method for unlawfully copying, reproducing, and distributing files in violation of the copyright laws of the United States. A broad range of copyrighted albums, audiovisual files, photographs, software, and other forms of media are available for illegal reproduction and distribution via the BitTorrent protocol.
- BitTorrent's decentralized nature. Because there are no central servers to enjoin from unlawfully distributing copyrighted content, there is no primary target on which to focus anti-piracy efforts. Indeed, the same decentralization that makes the BitTorrent protocol an extremely robust and efficient means of transferring enormous quantities of data also acts to insulate it from anti-piracy measures. This lawsuit is Plaintiff's only practical means of combating BitTorrent-based infringement of the Video.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

18. Plaintiff is the exclusive rights holder with respect to BitTorrent-based reproduction and distribution of the Video.

- The Video is currently registered in the United States Copyright Office (Copyright No. PA0001791654). (See Exhibit A to Complaint.)
- 20. The torrent file used to access the copyrighted material was named in a manner that would have provided an ordinary individual with notice that the Video was protected by the copyright laws of the United States.
- 21. Plaintiff employs proprietary peer-to-peer network forensic software to perform exhaustive real time monitoring of the BitTorrent-based swarm involved in distributing the Video. This software is effective in capturing data about the activity of peers in a swarm and their infringing conduct.
- 22. Defendant, using IP address 96.248.225.171, without Plaintiff's authorization or license, intentionally downloaded a torrent file particular to Plaintiff's Video, purposefully loaded that torrent file into his BitTorrent client—in this case, Azureus 4.7.0.2—entered a BitTorrent swarm particular to Plaintiff's Video, and reproduced and distributed the Video to numerous third parties.
- 23. Plaintiff's investigators detected Defendant's illegal download on 2012-06-28 at 07:19:47 (UTC). However, this is a simply a snapshot observation of when the IP address was *observed* in the BitTorrent swarm; the conduct took itself place before and after this date and time.
- 24. Defendant was part of a group of BitTorrent users or peers in a single swarm—a process generally described above—whose computers were collectively interconnected for the sharing of a particular unique file. The particular file a BitTorrent swarm is associated with has a unique file "hash"—i.e. a unique file identifier generated by an algorithm. The unique hash value in this case is identified as F016490BD8E60E184EC5B7052CEB1FA570A4AF11 (hereinafter "Hash Tag."), and common to all of the participants in the swarm.

COUNT I – COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT

- 25. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth fully herein.
- 26. Defendant's conduct infringes upon Plaintiff's exclusive rights of reproduction and distribution that are protected under the Copyright Act.
- 27. Defendant knew or had constructive knowledge that his acts constituted copyright infringement of Plaintiff's Video.
- 28. Defendant's conduct was willful within the meaning of the Copyright Act: intentional, and with indifference to the Plaintiff's rights.
- 29. Plaintiff has been damaged by Defendant's conduct, including but not limited to economic and reputation losses. Plaintiff continues to be damaged by such conduct, and has no adequate remedy at law to compensate the Plaintiff for all of the possible damages stemming from the Defendant's conduct.
- 30. Plaintiff hereby reserves the right, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c), to elect to recover statutory damages for each infringement, in lieu of seeking recovery of actual damages.
- 31. As Defendant's infringement was intentional and willful, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of statutory damages, exemplary damages, attorneys' fees, and the costs of the suit.

COUNT II – CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT

- 32. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth fully herein.
- 33. When users in this unique swarm all possess the same infringing work with the same exact hash value, it is because each infringer possesses an exact digital copy, containing the exact bits and pieces unique to that specific file of Plaintiff's original copyrighted work. They only way this happens in a BitTorrent swarm is through the sharing of these bits and pieces of each same

unique file, with the same unique hash value, between the users in the swarm. In essence, although hundreds of users may be uploading the copyrighted work, a single user will receive only the exact parts of a singular upload through that exact swarm, not a compilation of available pieces from various uploads.

- 34. Defendant published the Hash Tag to the BitTorrent network.
- 35. Defendant downloaded, uploaded and distributed the Video to other BitTorrent users through use of the hash-specified protocol in the unique swarm.
- 36. As each of the thousands of people who illegally downloaded the movie accessed this illegal publication, they derived portions of their illegal replication of the file from multiple persons, including, but not limited to, Defendant.
- 37. Defendant knew of the infringement, was conscious of his own infringement, and Defendant was fully concsious that his actions resulted in multiple other persons derivatively downloaded the file containing Plaintiff's Video.
- 38. The infringement by the other BitTorrent users could not have occurred without Defendant's participation in uploading Plaintiff's copyrighted works. As such, Defendant's participation in the infringing activities of others is substantial and contributed, for profit, to the infringing activity of thousands of other peers over the Internet across the world.
- 39. Defendant profited from this contributory infringement by way of being granted access to a greater library of other infringing works, some of which belonged to Plaintiff and some of which belonged to other copyright owners.

COUNT III – NEGLIGENCE

40. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth fully herein.

- 41. Defendant accessed, or controlled access to, the Internet connection used in performing the unauthorized copying and sharing of Plaintiff's Video, proximately causing financial harm to Plaintiff.
- 42. Defendant had a duty to secure his Internet connection. Defendant breached that duty by failing to secure his Internet connection.
- 43. Reasonable Internet users take steps to secure their Internet access accounts preventing the use of such accounts for an illegal purpose. Defendant's failure to secure his Internet access account, thereby allowing for its illegal use, constitutes a breach of the ordinary care that a reasonable Internet account holder would do under like circumstances.
- 44. In the alternative, Defendant secured his connection, but permitted an unknown third party to use his Internet connection to infringe on Plaintiff's Video. Defendant knew, or should have known, that this unidentified individual used Defendant's Internet connection for the aformentioned illegal activities. Defendant declined to monitor the unidentified third-party infringer's use of his computer Internet connection, demonstrating further negligence.
- 45. In the alternative, Defendant knew of, and allowed for, the unidentified third party infringer's use of his Internet connection for illegal purposes and thus was complicit in the unidentified third party's actions.
- 46. Upon information and belief, Defendant's failure to secure his Internet access account directly allowed for the copying and sharing of Plaintiff's Video over the BitTorrent protocol through Defendant's Internet connection, and interfered with Plaintiff's exclusive rights in the copyrighted work.
- 47. Upon information and belief, Defendant knew, or should have known of, the unidentified third party's infringing actions, and, despite this, Defendant directly, or indirectly, allowed for the copying and sharing of Plaintiff's Video over the BitTorrent protocol through

Defendant's Internet connection, and interfered with Plaintiff's exclusive rights in the copyrighted Video.

- 48. By virtue of his unsecured access, Defendant negligently allowed the use of his Internet access account to perform the above-described copying and sharing of Plaintiff's copyrighted Video.
- 49. Had Defendant taken reasonable care in securing access to this Internet connection, or monitoring the unidentified third-party individual's use of his Internet connection, such infringements as those described above would not have occurred by the use of Defendant's Internet access account.
- 50. Defendant's negligent actions allow others to unlawfully copy and share Plaintiff's copyrighted Video, proximately causing financial harm to Plaintiff and unlawfully interfering with Plaintiff's exclusive rights in the Video.

JURY DEMAND

51. Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial in this case.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests Judgment and relief as follows:

- Judgment against Defendant that he has: a) willfully infringed Plaintiff's rights in federally registered copyrights pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 501; and b) otherwise injured the business reputation and business of Plaintiff by Defendant's acts and conduct set forth in this Complaint;
- 2) Judgment in favor of the Plaintiff against Defendant for actual damages or statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504, at the election of Plaintiff, in an amount to be ascertained at trial;

1	3)	Order of impoundment under 17 U.S.C. §§ 503 & 509(a) impounding	all infringing
2	copies of P	Plaintiff's audiovisual works, photographs or other materials, which are in	Defendant's
3	possession o	or under his control;	
4	4)	On Count II, an order that Defendant is jointly and severally liable to the	ne Plaintiff in
5	the full amo	ount of Judgment on the basis of a common law claim for contributory in	fringement of
7	copyright; f	for an award of compensatory damages in favor of the Plaintiff and again	st Defendant,
8	jointly and s	severally, in an amount to be determined at trial;	
9	5)	On Count III, an order that Defendant is jointly and severally liable to the	he Plaintiff in
10	the full amo	ount of Judgment on the basis of Defendant's negligence in allowing an unic	dentified third
11	party access	s his Internet account and, through it, violate Plaintiff's copyrighted works;	for an award
12	of compensa	satory damages in favor of the Plaintiff and against Defendant, jointly and se	everally, in an
14	amount to b	be determined at trial;	
15	6)	Judgment in favor of Plaintiff against the Defendant awarding the Plain	tiff attorneys'
16	fees, litigati	ion expenses (including fees and costs of expert witnesses), and other costs	of this action;
17	and		
18	7)	Judgment in favor of the Plaintiff against Defendant, awarding Plainti	ff declaratory
19 20	and injuncti	ive or other equitable relief as may be just and warranted under the circumsta	ances.
21	///		
22	///		
23	///		
24	///		
25	///		
2627	///		
28	///	11	
			CASE NO.

1	
1	Respectfully Submitted,
2	PRENDA LAW INC.
3	DATED: July 24, 2012
4	
5	
6	Brett L. Gibbs, Esq. (SBN 251000) Of Counsel to Prenda Law Inc.
7	38 Miller Avenue, #263 Mill Valley, CA 94941 blgibbs@wefightpiracy.com Attorney for Plaintiff
8	Attorney for Plaintiff
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	12
	COMPLAINT CASE NO.

1	DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL		
2	Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial as provided by FRCP 38(a).		
3			
4	By: /s/ Brett L. Gibbs		
5	Brett L. Gibbs, Esq. (SBN 251000)		
6	Attorney for Plaintiff		
7	A ttorney for Flainty		
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18 19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	13		
	COMPLAINT CASE NO.		

EXHIBIT A

WebVoyage Record View 1

http://cocatalog.loc.gov/cgi-bin/Pwebrecon.cgi?Search_Arg=Fi...



Public Catalog

Copyright Catalog (1978 to present)

Search Request: Left Anchored Title = Five Fan Favorites

Search Results: Displaying 1 of 1 entries



Labeled View

Five Fan Favorites.

Type of Work: Motion Picture

Registration Number / Date: PA0001791654 / 2012-05-29

Application Title: Five Fan Favorites.

Title: Five Fan Favorites.

Description: 7 electronic files (eService)

Copyright Claimant: Ingenuity 13 LLC. Address: Springates East, Government Road, Charlestown, Saint

Kitts-Nevis.

Date of Creation: 2012

Date of Publication: 2012-05-24

Nation of First Publication: United States

Authorship on Application: Ingenuity 13 LLC, employer for hire; Domicile: United States; Citizenship: United

States. Authorship: entire motion picture, production/producer, direction/director,

script/screenplay, cinematography/cinematographer, editing/editor.

Copyright Note: C.O. correspondence.

Names: Ingenuity13 LLC



Save, Print and Email (Help Page)				
Select Download Format	Full Record	Format for Print/Save		
Enter your email address:				

Help Search History Titles Start Over

Contact Us | Request Copies | Get a Search Estimate | Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) about Copyright |

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Percy Anderson and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Paul Abrams.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV12- 6662 PA (PLAx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related	d motions should	be noticed on th	ne calendar of the	Magistrate Judge
-----------------------	------------------	------------------	--------------------	------------------

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

============

\mathbf{M}	Western Division
1	312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8
, /	Los Angeles, CA 90012

Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516 Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

BENEFIT STATE			
533300	LEAR	EOB	10
DODESTI:	-	-	111,555,555

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself D) INGENUITY 13 LLC)	DEFENDANTS JOHN DOE		
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If yo yourself, provide same.) Brett L. Gibbs, Of Counsel to Prenda Law Inc. 38 Miller Avenue, #263 Mill Valley, CA 94941; Tel: (415) 325-5900	ou are representing	Attorneys (If Known)		
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.)		SHIP OF PRINCIPAL PART X in one box for plaintiff and of		s Only
☐ I U.S. Government Plaintiff ✓ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen of This		DEF Incorporated or I of Business in th	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizer of Parties in Item III)		ther State 2 ect of a Foreign Country 3	of Business in A	d Principal Place ☐ 5 ☐ 5 nother State ☐ 6 ☐ 6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.) ✓ 1 Original □ 2 Removed from State Court □ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: ✓ Yes	Reopened	5 Transferred from another dis	Dist Litig	
□ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Act □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 195 Contract Product □ 195 Contract Product □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	TORTS PERSONAL INJUR 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Productiability 320 Assault, Libel Slander Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Productiability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liabil 360 Other Personal Injury Med Malpract 365 Personal Injury Product Liabil 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liabil	PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/Acco- mmodations 444 Welfare 445 American with Disabilities -	□ 530 General □ 535 Death Penalty □ 540 Mandamus/ Other □ 550 Civil Rights □ 555 Prison Condition FORFEITURE / PENALTY □ 610 Agriculture □ 620 Other Food & Drug □ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 □ 630 Liquor Laws □ 640 R.R. & Truck	□ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act PROPERTY RIGHTS ■ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY
nation Under Equal Access to Justice 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 250 All Other Real Property	Liability IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application Habeas Corputaline Detained Alien Detained Other Immigrate Actions	Disabilities - Other s- 440 Other Civil Rights	☐ 650 Airline Regs ☐ 660 Occupational Safety /Health ☐ 690 Other	□ 864 SSID THE AVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609

CV12-6662

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDEN		this action been pr	reviously filed in this court a	nd dismissed, remanded or closed? ☑ No □ Yes		
VIII(b). RELA		any cases been pro	eviously filed in this court the	at are related to the present case? ✓ No		
Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case: (Check all boxes that apply) A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.						
IX. VENUE: (When completing the	following informat	tion, use an additional sheet i	f necessary.)		
				if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. this box is checked, go to item (b).		
County in this	District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
				St. Kitts and Nevis		
				If other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).		
County in this	District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
Unknown - C	Geolocation tracks I	P address to Los	Angeles County			
			outside of this District; State	I if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose. ved.		
County in this	District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
Unknown - G	eolocation tracks II	address to Los A	Angeles County			
	0		entura, Santa Barbara, or e tract of land involved	San Luis Obispo Counties		
X. SIGNATUR	RE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER):	Brett gibbs	Date July 25, 2012		
Notice to (Counsel/Parties: The pers as required by lav	e CV-71 (JS-44) C	ivil Cover Sheet and the info	rmation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings the of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ting the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)		
	al codes relating to So					
	Sature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement o	f Cause of Action		
8	61	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))			
8	62	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (30 U.S.C. 923)			
8	63	DIWC		d workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))		
			All claims filed for widow Act, as amended. (42 U.S	vs or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security S.C. 405(g))		
8	64	SSID	All claims for supplement Act, as amended.	al security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security		
RSI All claims for retiremen U.S.C. (g))				old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42		

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2